



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,667	02/15/2002	Allon G. Englman	47079-0127	2996
30223	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C. 225 WEST WASHINGTON SUITE 2600 CHICAGO, IL 60606			HSU, RYAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3713	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/077,667

Applicant(s)

ENGLMAN, ALLON

Examiner

Ryan Hsu

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,20-22 and 25-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,20-22 and 25-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/05/2005 has been entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Claypole et al. (GB 2,353,128 A).**

With reference to claims 20-21, Claypole discloses an gaming machine that is implements a wagering game on a game machine wherein the machine receives a wager from a player (*see bottom game and game button [330] of Fig. 3*), and randomly selects an outcome from a plurality of possible outcomes, the plurality of possible outcomes include a plurality of winning outcomes defined by a pay table (*see paylines 340, 342, and 344 of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*), the winning outcomes in the pay table being directly associated with respective non-credit-based awards; and provides the associated non-credit based award if the selected outcome is one of the winning outcomes (*see page 10: ln 24- pg 11: ln 20*).

Art Unit: 3713

Additionally, Claypole implements a bonus game wherein the non-credit based awards include a number of movements of a space identifier along a trail, the number of movements varying by the winning outcomes produced by the random outcomes (*see track 356 of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*). Furthermore Claypole implements a trail that includes a plurality of spaces, where at least some of the spaces being associated with respective credit-based awards (*see trail 348', 350', and 352' of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*).

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claypole et al. (GB 2,353,128 A) and in view of Yosoloff (US 6,311,976 B1).**

In regards to claim 22, Claypole teaches a game machine that implements a method with a gaming machine that receives a wager from a player. Additionally, Claypole implements method that randomly selects an outcome from a plurality of possible outcomes (*ie: top game*), the plurality of possible outcomes including a plurality of winning outcomes defined by a pay table (*top track [356] of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*), the winning outcomes in the pay table being directly associated with respective non-credit based awards; and providing the

Art Unit: 3713

associated non-credit-based award if the selected outcome is one of the winning outcomes (*see movement around track [356] of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*). However, Claypole is silent with regard to a non-credit based award including a number of free plays of the game, the number of free plays varying by the different winning outcomes.

Yosoloff teaches in a related art, the ability to provide an award that includes a number of free plays of the games varied by the different winning outcomes (*see col. 10: 20-24*). Yosoloff offers these types of prizes as an added incentive for players to continuing playing while enhancing the experience for the user. One would be motivated to incorporate the free plays into Claypole in order to enhance the experience for the user. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in order to implement the “free-play” teachings of Yoseloff with the game machine taught by Claypole.

**Claims 1-17 and 25-41, and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Claypole et al. (GB 2,353,128 A) in view of Walker et al. (6,077,163).**

In regards to claim 1 and 25, Claypole teaches a method of conducting a wagering game on a gaming machine that allows a user to place a wager (to purchase a series of plays of a basic portion of the game wherein the single wager is allocated to an entire series of plays (*ie: a flat rate for a duration or plurality of plays*) and not being associated with any one of the series of plays). Furthermore, Claypole implements a method of play wherein a response to a single wager a player is provided a series of randomly generated outcomes of each play and provides an accumulation feature that accumulates an element of the game over a plurality of the plays in the series (*trails 348', 350', and 352' of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*). However,

Art Unit: 3713

Claypole is silent with regards to implementing block wagering, where a single wager is allocated to an entire series of plays and the wager is not being associated with any one of the series of plays.

Walker et al. teaches the use of the block wagering method in a related gaming machine. Additionally, Walker teaches the use of implementing block wagering where a player may pay a “flat-rate” in order to purchase an interval of time to play a series of games. Walker discloses that this interval may be time, handle pulls, and any other segment in which a slot machine could be divided (*see col. 3: ln 10-20*). Walker teaches that one would be motivated to implement this type of wagering system in order to attract customers that are interested in the gaming machine tournaments where a flat rate price allows unlimited play during a duration of a series of plays (*see col. 1: ln 20-30*). Walker teaches that this system allows flexibility to these users so they do not have to follow the tournament schedules of the gaming establishments. Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to implement the teachings of Walker’s block wagering system into Claypole’s gaming machine in order to increase its appeal to users that enjoy the method of slot machine tournaments (*see col. 1: ln 20-45*).

Claims 2 and 26, Claypole teaches the use of a gaming machine wherein the basic portion is selected from a group consisting of slots, poker, keno, bingo, blackjack, and roulette (*see mechanical reels 312, 314, 316 of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*).

Claims 3-4, 28-29, Claypole discloses an accumulation feature that is triggered by a special outcome in the basic portion wherein the accumulated element is a position on a trail, ladder, or meter (*see trails 348', 350', and 352' of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*).

Claims 5-8, 30-33 are disclosed by Claypole, wherein a method of a position identifies a credit amount, a multiplier, a number of free plays of the basic portion, a bonus round, or movement to another position on the trail, the ladder, or meter (*see trails 348', 350', and 352' of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*). Additionally this accumulated element is a collected object. The disclosed "bonus" is the response to a collection of a predetermined number of the object during the series of plays (*see page 6: ln 27-page 8: ln 16*). Furthermore, Claypole implements a method where the accumulation feature is reset to include no accumulated elements once the previous series of plays is finished where it is a function of the invention that is part of the software design.

In regard to claims 9-15, 34-39, Claypole teaches a method with a gaming machine, wherein each play includes a random event regarding the reels that is independent of other plays in the series (*see mechanical reels 312, 314, or 316 of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof, pg. 6: ln 10-26*). The game also consists of a basic portion and a bonus feature triggered by a special outcome in the basic portion (*ie: a winning line that triggers a win on the bonus game*) (*see reel outcomes 340, 342, and 344 of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*). Claypole also discloses prior to the completion of the series of plays an accumulated element that can be redeemed if a certain condition is met by a predetermined event in the series of plays. This predetermined event corresponds to a certain position of the element on a trail, ladder or meter (*see 348' 350' and 352' of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*).

Claims 16-17, 40-41 are disclosed by Claypole, wherein a wagering game provides an award to the player if the outcome is a winning outcome and the basic portion includes a slot game having a plurality of symbol-bearing reels that, during each play in the series, are spun and

Art Unit: 3713

stopped to place symbols on the reels in visual association with a display area (*see jackpot 348', 350' and 352' of Fig. 3*).

Regarding claims 43-44, Claypole discloses a method wherein redeeming the accumulated element for a bonus event in response to a predetermined event (*see indicators and trails 348', 350' and 352' of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*) before completing the series of plays; playing the bonus event; and continuing the series of events (*see page 11: ln 4-24*). Additionally the predetermined event corresponds to a collection of a predetermined number of the accumulated element (*see track 356 and trails 348', 350' and 352' of Fig. 3 and the related description thereof*).

**Claim 18 and 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claypole et al. and Walker et al. in further view of Duhamel (USPN 6,311,976).**

The disclosure of Claypole and Walker as discussed above and is, therefore, incorporated herein. However, Claypole and Walker lack in disclosing a draw poker game. Duhamel, in an analogous gaming system, teaches, in FIGS. 2-9, col. 5: ln 47-67 & col. 6: ln 1-37, a draw poker game and poker hand rankings table. One would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Duhamel with the teachings of Claypole and Walker in order to diversify the type of games offered by the gaming machine and increase the overall excitement of the game. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Duhamel with Claypole and Walker in order to create a more exciting game machine.



***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on 7/05/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, with regard to Farrell, the Applicant claims that Farrell does not disclose the features in one game. However, Examiner has fully considered the arguments and deemed them not persuasive. Although it may appear that Farrell has two distinct games, the two games implemented into Farrell are integrated together. The result of the first game (*ie: the X's and O's game*) directly effects the starting position of the disclosed ladder game (*see ladder [9] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof and page 8: ln 1-5*). Therefore although they may appear to be two distinct games they are actually two parts in one game. Furthermore, the Applicant argues that there is no teaching of a pay table with non-credit-based awards causing a number of possible movements along ladder [9]. Examiner respectfully disagrees, Farrell states that at the end of the matrix X's and O's game if one or more lines is all X's or O's the player enters the ladder [9] at the level corresponding to the total number of completed lines. Therefore the pay table associated with the ladder game would be a one to one ratio of a completed line to a higher starting level on the ladder [9]. Examiner believes that Farrell still qualifies as a 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and anticipates the limitations as discussed above. However, Examiner has withdrawn the rejection and presented Claypole as it more clearly anticipates the applicant's invention.

With regard to claim 22, Applicant's arguments, see Remarks/Arguments, filed 7/05/2005, with respect to the rejection of claim 22 under Yoseloff have been fully considered

Art Unit: 3713

and are persuasive. Therefore, the previous 102(b) rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made with Claypole in view of Yoseloff.

With regard to claims 1 and 25, Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be direct to Ryan Hsu whose telephone number is (571)-272-7148. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M Thai can be reached at (571)-272-7147.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1-866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
RH

September 1, 2005



**JULIE BROCKETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**